



## THE CPER POCKET GUIDE SERIES

Written for labor relations practitioners from both sides of the table, CPER Pocket Guides are a concise and affordable resource to the numerous laws operating in the public sector. Easy to read and convenient to carry, they are also a handy resource and an excellent training tool.

- ☐ **Pocket Guide to the Fair Labor Standards Act** (1st edition 2000) NEW!

\$15 each; discounts available for larger orders

- ☐ **Pocket Guide to the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act**  
(9th edition 1999)

- ☐ **Pocket Guide to Unfair Practices: California Public Sector** (3rd edition 1999)

- ☐ **Pocket Guide to Workplace Rights of Public Employees** (2nd edition 1998)

\$10 each; discounts available for larger orders

- ☐ **Pocket Guide to the Americans With Disabilities Acts** (1st edition 1998)

- ☐ **Pocket Guide to the Family and Medical Leave Acts** (1st edition 1997)

\$8 each; discounts available for larger orders

- ☐ **Pocket Guide to Public Sector Arbitration: California** (2nd edition 1997)

- ☐ **Pocket Guide to the Educational Employment Relations Act** (5th edition 1997)

- ☐ **Pocket Guide to the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act** (10th edition 1997)

- ☐ **Pocket Guide to the Ralph C. Dills Act** (1st edition 1996)

\$7 each; discounts available for larger orders

A COMPLETE CPER PUBLICATIONS LIST IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST

### POCKET GUIDE ORDER INFORMATION

**Order from** University of California Press Journals  
**By Mail:** 2000 Center St., Ste. 303  
Berkeley, CA 94704-1223  
**By Fax:** 510-642-9917  
**By E-mail:** [jorders@ucpress.ucop.edu](mailto:jorders@ucpress.ucop.edu)  
(For Rush Orders ONLY, call 510-643-7154)

**Method of payment:** All orders must be prepaid. Make checks payable to UC Regents-CPER.  
VISA and Master Card welcome.

**Shipping and handling:** 1 copy @ \$2.50; 2-49 copies @ \$.50 each; 50+ copies @ \$.25 each.

The CPER staff can be reached at 510-643-7092.

Or, visit the CPER web site at <http://socrates/~iir/cper/cper.html>

For more information about the CPER Program, see inside back cover.

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

# CPER

*A Periodical of Employee Relations in the Public Sector*

AUGUST 2000

NO. 143

---

**Barbarians at the Gate: The History  
of Academic Student Employee  
Organizing at U.C.**

---

**Protecting the Rights of State Employees  
Against Compulsory Unionism**

---

**School Vouchers Revisited**

---

**Recent Developments**

---

**Resources**

---

**Public Employment Relations Board Cases**

---

**Public Sector Arbitration**

---

RECEIVED

AUG 23 2000

UCI LIBRARY

INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA • BERKELEY

JK  
8755  
C35



# California Public Employee Relations

■ a news periodical published by the Institute of Industrial Relations at Berkeley

## Staff...

Editor: Carol Vendrillo, J.D.  
Associate Editor: Whitney Gabriel, J.D.  
Managing Editor: Stefanie Kalmin  
Production-Circulation Manager: Sharon Melnyk  
Contributing Editor: Ritu Ahuja

## Subscriptions...

The CPER annual subscription includes

CPER Magazine—six times a year  
CPER Comprehensive Index  
CPER Telephone Information Exchange  
Annual: \$250

**Special renewal reminders sent automatically to subscribers**

### Ordering CPER Magazine

All orders must be **prepaid**. Make checks payable to U.C. Regents-CPER and send them to:  
University of California Press Journals, 2000 Center St., Ste. 303, Berkeley, CA 94704-1223.  
Subscribers outside North America—please add \$20.00 for airfreight delivery.

Credit card orders (VISA or MasterCard only) may also be submitted by fax to 510-642-9917,  
or e-mail to [jorders@ucpress.ucop.edu](mailto:jorders@ucpress.ucop.edu).

## Need more information?

Call the CPER offices at 510-643-7092 or submit inquiries by fax to 510-642-6432.

Address requests for permission to reprint CPER articles to: Editor, CPER, Institute of Industrial Relations, 2521 Channing Way, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-5555. Fax requests to 510-642-6432.

## If you have information...

CPER provides up-to-date, nonadversary information to those involved in employer-employee relations in the public sector. We encourage reader submissions and responses to our Open Forum, and we welcome suggestions regarding the content of future issues and information that could be the basis for an article or report.

See our website at <http://socrates/~iir/cper/cper.html>



Cover Printed on Recycled Paper

**Institute of Industrial Relations    University of California    Berkeley, CA 94720**

Copyright, 2000, by The Regents of the University of California. Requests for permission to reproduce all or part of this publication should be addressed to the Editor.

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RELATIONS (CPER) (ISSN 0194-3073) is published bi-monthly in February, April, June, August, October, and December, for \$250 a year, by the Institute of Industrial Relations, 2521 Channing Way, University of California, Berkeley CA 94720. Periodical postage paid at Berkeley, CA. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to California Public Employee Relations (CPER); c/o University of California Press Journals, 2000 Center St., Ste. 303, Berkeley, CA 94704-1223, or e-mail to [jorders@ucpress.ucop.edu](mailto:jorders@ucpress.ucop.edu).



# Contents

## 2 Letter From the Editor

## 4 Barbarians at the Gate: The History of Academic Student Employee Organizing at U.C.

Ricardo Ochoa

## 11 Protecting the Rights of State Employees — Against Compulsory Unionism

Milton Chappell and Randy Wanke

## 17 School Vouchers Revisited

Priscilla Winslow

## 21 Recent Developments in California Public Jurisdictions

- 21 Public Schools
- 32 Local Government
- 41 Higher Education
- 47 State Employees
- 50 Discrimination
- 58 General

## 60 Public Employment Relations Board Cases

- 60 Orders and Decisions
- 67 Activity Reports

## 70 Public Sector Arbitration

- 70 Recent Developments
- 71 Arbitration Log



# Barbarians at the Gate

## The History of Academic Student Employee Organizing at U.C.

By Ricardo Ochoa



Ricardo Ochoa was the president of AGSE/UAW Local 2165 at U.C. Berkeley from 1997 until 1999. He is currently an associate in the law firm of Rothner, Segall & Greenstone, representing public and private sector labor unions.

developed beyond the embryonic stage, but a few such nascent efforts evolved into sustained organizing drives. A look at the history of ASE organizing at U.C. demonstrates certain factors shared by those campaigns that developed into viable unions.

### DEFINING VIABILITY

Of course, it is necessary to first define what is meant by "viable." An organizing campaign is termed viable if it (1) establishes a significant base of support across campus; (2) has some degree of institutionalality; and (3) is able to mobilize its membership. While there are many ways to assess whether an organizing drive has satisfied these criteria, one useful indicator is whether the group was able to organize a reasonably effective work stoppage. In fact, the viability of three of the four campaigns described in this article was more or less demonstrated by means of a strike. The fourth attempt, which developed into the UAW campaign, established its viability before striking — and has since engaged in more strikes than all the other unions at the University of California combined.

On May 18, 2000, the United Auto Workers announced that academic student employees at the eight University of California general teaching campuses had voted to ratify historic first collective bargaining agreements between the UAW unions at each campus and U.C. The agreements, covering nearly 10,000 teaching assistants, readers, and tutors, capped a 17-year campaign among ASEs — who provide nearly 60 percent of undergraduate instruction at U.C. — to win a voice at work.

While the campaign to gain recognition and a first contract lasted 17 years, ASEs persistently have been trying to organize throughout the U.C. system for much longer than that. Many of these earlier attempts never

Significantly, this schema does not equate viability with success. Only one organizing effort — that of the UAW — ultimately was successful. This article is not intended to analyze the factors that led to its success in winning recognition and a first contract. Rather, this piece will look at the early years of what became the UAW campaign when its viability was being established, leaving to another article the fascinating story of how the union eventually prevailed.

### PRE-HISTORY (1930s)

The first recorded instance of ASEs organizing at U.C. was the work of a group known as University Assistants and Readers, which was organizing TAs and readers at U.C. Berkeley as early as October 1938. Unfortunately, not much is known about UAR, making it difficult to determine whether the group was ever viable. One of the few known details concerns its efforts to enforce a "minimum wage law" for readers, which the U.C. Berkeley administration adopted in 1938.<sup>1</sup> It is unclear, however, what role UAR had in the creation of the minimum wage policy. In terms of its longevity, all that is known is that UAR was active at least through November 1939.<sup>2</sup>

### THE FIRST WAVE OF ORGANIZING (1963-1972)

The first significant series of attempts at ASE organizing at U.C. began in the 1960s. The primary catalyst for these efforts was the widespread political upheaval erupting on U.C. campuses. Not coincidentally, this first wave of activity corresponded with the start of ASE organizing campaigns nationally, as evidenced by the formation of the Teaching Assistants Association at the University of Wisconsin at Madison in 1966 and the University Teaching Fellows Union, which later became the Graduate Employee Organization, at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor in 1970.

**The birth of AFT Local 1570.** The Economics Teaching Assistants Association was formed at U.C. Berkeley in the 1963-64 school year, with the help of three TAs in the economics department who had extensive experience in organized labor.<sup>3</sup> From the beginning, ETAA engaged in quasi-union activity, including a successful effort to win the reappointment of three of its members to TA positions in spring 1964.

On October 9, 1964, graduate students formed the Graduate Coordinating Committee in support of the Free Speech Movement and its protests that rocked the U.C. Berkeley campus.<sup>4</sup> A month later, in mid-November, the

GCC brought together 300 graduate students to ratify a provisional constitution for University-Employed Graduate Students, a labor union for TAs at U.C. Berkeley.<sup>5</sup> On December 1, the GCC/UGS voted to strike on December 4 if the U.C. Berkeley administration failed to drop expulsion proceedings against Mario Savio and Art Goldberg.<sup>6</sup> On December 3, a spontaneous student strike erupted, joined immediately by GCC/UGS members. On the first day of the strike, ETAA formally urged all TAs in the economics department to respect the picket lines.<sup>7</sup> At its height, approximately one-half of all TAs on campus were on strike.<sup>8</sup>

In the wake of the FSM strike, there was a hard-fought contest between two factions inside UGS as to whether the union should focus on workplace issues or broader political and educational reform. The faction favoring a union rooted in the working conditions of ASEs, which aligned itself with ETAA, swept every post in UGS' first internal union election.<sup>9</sup>

This contest over the direction of UGS also was played out in the decision to affiliate with an international union. UGS considered joining forces with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; International Longshore and Warehouse Union; American Federation of Teachers; and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. Only AFT and AFSCME expressed interest in an affiliation. The UGS faction favoring a "collective bargaining" slate pushed for affiliation with AFT; those pressing the broader "political" agenda urged affiliation with AFSCME. In the end, ASEs voted nearly unanimously to affiliate with AFT.<sup>10</sup> On February 1, 1965, AFT chartered Local 1570, University-Employed Graduate Students, consisting of graduate students working as TAs, research assistants, readers, and nonprofessional library personnel at U.C. Berkeley.<sup>11</sup>

Local 1570's next big test came a year and a half later. In the fall of 1966, Governor Ronald Reagan fired U.C. President Clark Kerr, and U.C. Berkeley again erupted in protest. In December 1966, as part of broader protests against the heavy police presence on campus, Local 1570 went on a political strike "to establish the principle that outside police forces should never again disrupt the internal affairs of the campus community."<sup>12</sup> As a result of that strike, the union began to negotiate with the administration over various terms and conditions of employment, such as a grievance procedure, dues check-off, and recognition of Local 1570 as the exclusive representative of all ASEs at U.C. Berkeley.<sup>13</sup> The administration refused to voluntarily recognize Local 1570 or grant it dues check-off, but the university did negotiate a grievance procedure for ASEs.

Despite the refusal to recognize Local 1570, it remained an active part of the campus community. On January 21, 1969, the Third-World Liberation Front began a student strike at U.C. Berkeley, demanding the creation of a Third-World College. On February 18, 1969, after the police attacked an informational picket line of its members supporting TWLF, Local 1570 voted to strike for union organizing rights and in support of TWLF's demands.<sup>14</sup> On March 2, Local 1570 received strike sanction from the California Federation of Teachers, and AFSCME Local 1695 (representing clerical employees at U.C. Berkeley) voted to respect Local 1570's picket lines.<sup>15</sup> Local 1570 negotiated with U.C. Berkeley until 1972, when AFT revoked its charter for failing to pay per capita dues to the International.<sup>16</sup> According to a former president of Local 1570, AFT moved against the local at least partly in retaliation for its involvement in internal union reform movements opposed to Al Shanker, AFT's international president.

*Nascent organizing efforts at UCLA.* Meanwhile, in November 1966, as the crisis over Kerr's dismissal as U.C. president intensified, graduate student employees at UCLA began to seriously discuss unionization. On January 30, 1967, they decided to form an organization to unite TAs and RAs.<sup>17</sup> The organization was formally christened on February 7, 1967, as Graduate Academic Employees.<sup>18</sup> On February 20, GAE voted to affiliate with AFT, rather than remain independent or ally itself with the Graduate Student Association.<sup>19</sup> However, a scant 10 days later, on March 2, 1967, the organization collapsed amid a series of resignations and recriminations among members of its steering committee, many of whom accused GAE of "fail[ing] to establish a moderate, broad-based organization" and instead becoming a "militant narrow-based group."<sup>20</sup>

## THE SECOND WAVE (1975-1977)

In 1975, a second surge of ASE organizing gathered strength throughout the U.C. system. This wave, however, was prompted not so much by campus political upheaval as by cutbacks in TA positions.

*Graduate Student Union at U.C. San Diego.* On March 7, 1975, TAs in the literature department at U.C. San Diego announced they would commence a "work action" in response to a reduction in departmental TA positions.<sup>21</sup> The job action was called off a month later after the department met most of the TAs' demands.<sup>22</sup> Emboldened by this success, TAs in the literature department expanded their efforts to the entire campus. On May 5, 1975, 75 TAs representing 13 departments

voted unanimously to form the Graduate Student Union in the face of campuswide cutbacks in TA support.<sup>23</sup> Within two weeks, membership swelled to 300. GSU organized around four demands. They wanted appointments to be for at least 50 percent time and to extend for an entire year. They also wanted to prevent any increase in the student/TA ratio and sought fee/tuition waivers.<sup>24</sup> On May 27, faced with the administration's refusal to meet its demands, GSU voted unanimously to strike on June 3 and 4.<sup>25</sup> A noontime rally on June 3 in support of the GSU strike attracted over 1,000 people.<sup>26</sup>

When undergraduate students returned from the summer break, the dispute between GSU and the administration remained unresolved. On November 3, GSU voted to conduct a three-day work stoppage, scheduled for November 19-21, to be followed by an indefinite strike planned for January 1976.<sup>27</sup> GSU's November 1975 strike led to the cancellation of over 70 percent of TA-led discussion sections.<sup>28</sup> On January 8, 1976, however, GSU postponed the indefinite strike scheduled to start on January 12, in favor of a "work-to-rule" action.<sup>29</sup> The strike plan was called off because GSU leadership was concerned it was not strong enough to win a sustained work stoppage.

GSU leaders attributed the union's inability to withstand a protracted strike in part to its lack of affiliation with an AFL-CIO union. As far back as October 22, 1975, GSU had announced that it was conducting affiliation talks with AFT and AFSCME.<sup>30</sup> In November 1975, GSU established communication with graduate students active in an AFSCME-affiliated ASE union at U.C. Berkeley.<sup>31</sup> That same month, however, GSU members narrowly voted down a proposal to affiliate with an AFL-CIO union.<sup>32</sup> In February 1976, GSU announced that it would focus on organizing statewide and that it saw a possible affiliation with AFSCME as a step in that direction.<sup>33</sup> Finally, in April 1976, GSU signed on with AFSCME.<sup>34</sup>

*AFT Local 1781 at UCLA.* On April 5, 1977, graduate students at UCLA, led by the Student Academic Employees Union, AFT Local 1781, rallied against announced TA cutbacks in the College of Letters and Science. They raised the possibility of a strike if the cuts were implemented,<sup>35</sup> and on April 26, Local 1781 voted to stage a two-day strike on April 28-29.<sup>36</sup> Upwards of 250 TAs participated in the job action.<sup>37</sup> At the time, Local 1781 represented 300 TAs, fewer than half the number employed at UCLA.

A week later, upset with what it characterized as administrative inaction, Local 1781 announced plans for

a three-day strike on May 16-18. On May 6, a representative from AFT 1781 attended an AFSCME meeting in Berkeley "to encourage other representatives from TA unions at Berkeley and San Diego to join in a statewide TA walkout."<sup>38</sup> At that meeting, "TA representatives from three U.C. campuses — Berkeley, San Diego, and Riverside — expressed concern" over proposed TA cutbacks.<sup>39</sup> The president of the AFSCME-affiliated TA union at U.C. Riverside proposed a "'southern coalition' that would consist of U.C. Riverside, UCLA, and U.C. San Diego" to "organize a University-wide attack" against the possible TA cuts.<sup>40</sup>

On May 13, just days before the scheduled May 16-18 strike, however, Local 1781 members voted 106-77 against going forward.<sup>41</sup> On May 18, Local 1781 announced that it would postpone further protests against TA cutbacks until the following fall.<sup>42</sup> Both the decision not to strike and the decision to postpone all further protests were attributed to a lack of union organization. But by November, Local 1781 claimed that the administration had "done a turnabout in its attitude," even though it had cut the number of TAs in UCLA's College of Letters and Science for the 1977-78 school year. Soon thereafter, Local 1781 disappeared.

## THE THIRD AND FINAL WAVE (1978-PRESENT)

The third wave of ASE organizing came quickly on the heels of the previous one. What differentiated these new efforts from those of GSU and Local 1781, however, was that they were, by and large, prompted by passage of the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act and the related surge in union organizing among all employees in the U.C. system.

*ASE unionization takes hold at U.C. Berkeley.* In 1978, the Union of Graduate Assistants, Berkeley, was formed and sought to represent all academically employed graduate students.<sup>43</sup> UGAB immediately began educating ASEs about the passage of HEERA and its effects on ASE organizing at U.C. From the beginning, UGAB recognized that the status of ASEs under HEERA was unsettled and that membership mobilization would be required to win collective bargaining rights. Teresa Ghilarducci, a leader in UGAB and the external affairs chair for the U.C. Berkeley Graduate Assembly, noted "the proclivity of graduate assistants at U.C. to organize" and predicted that "a strong graduate assistants union requesting a bargaining unit before the Public Employment Relations Board may be sufficient to negate" the ambiguity present in the law.<sup>44</sup> UGAB had at least 100 active members and was in communication

with ASEs at other U.C. campuses, notably U.C. Davis. It is unclear, however, what became of UGAB after 1979.

In 1982, TAs and RAs at U.C. Berkeley organized the Association of Graduate Student Employees.<sup>45</sup> In spring 1983, AGSE voted to constitute itself as a union and, pursuant to HEERA, demanded to meet with the administration as a non-exclusive representative of ASEs at U.C. Berkeley. The administration responded by claiming that ASEs are not covered by HEERA. After hundreds of AGSE members marched through campus in protest, the administration opened talks with the union. These discussions resulted in the implementation of an installment plan for the payment of fees and the creation of a "late paycheck expeditor" position in the payroll office. By December 1983, AGSE represented over 1,000 ASEs at U.C. Berkeley.

At the same time, in September 1983, undergraduates working in staff positions (primarily as student library employees) organized the Student Employees' Association and demanded to meet with the university as the non-exclusive representative of non-academic student employees.<sup>46</sup> By 1985, SEA also was representing graduate students in non-academic positions. AGSE and SEA worked closely up through 1985, though SEA disappeared soon thereafter.

AGSE pursued a variety of tactics designed to pressure the administration and eventually win collective bargaining rights for ASEs. On November 29, 1983, AGSE filed unfair practice charges with PERB over the administration's failure to meet and discuss with AGSE as a non-exclusive representative of ASEs, as well as over the administration's refusal to allow voluntary dues check-off.<sup>47</sup>

That winter, AGSE decided to try to amend HEERA to explicitly include ASEs within the coverage of the act.<sup>48</sup> State Assembly Member Tom Bates, who then represented the Berkeley area, carried the bill during the 1984 legislative session. In February 1985, during PERB hearings over whether ASEs were covered by HEERA, the U.C. Berkeley administration conceded that readers and tutors were covered by the act.<sup>49</sup>

During the fall of 1985, AGSE filed 286 unfair practice charges with PERB in response to the administration's reclassification of TA positions, which AGSE claimed was in retaliation for its organizing efforts.<sup>50</sup> In May 1987, AGSE and the administration settled those reclassification charges, in part by recognizing AGSE as the non-exclusive representative of acting instructors.<sup>51</sup> Soon thereafter, AGSE decided to establish a strike fund.



In the span of three years, therefore, AGSE had won collective bargaining rights for readers, tutors, and acting instructors at U.C. Berkeley, using a combination of legal, legislative, and membership pressure.

**ASE unionization spreads.** While unionization was taking hold at U.C. Berkeley, ASEs were busy organizing on other U.C. campuses as well. In 1979, a TA union of unknown name began organizing at U.C. Davis, with activists recruited from the Graduate Student Association and a \$100 grant from AFT. The union demanded to be recognized as a non-exclusive employee organization and planned to coordinate a major organizing drive alongside AFSCME's efforts to sign up other U.C. employees. The Davis group quickly reached out to UGAB at U.C. Berkeley and proposed that "the TAs unions from each campus...create some kind of central University-wide Organizing Committee."<sup>52</sup> As with UGAB, however, this effort soon faded away.

In 1981, the Graduate Student Employees Committee was formed at U.C. Santa Cruz as an advocacy group for TAs and RAs.<sup>53</sup> In 1983, it was renamed the Graduate Student Employees Association and became a labor union.<sup>54</sup> By October 1983, 40 percent of ASEs at U.C. Santa Cruz had joined GSEA.<sup>55</sup> In spite of this, GSEA went dormant in 1986. Meanwhile, in 1983, at the same time that AGSE and GSEA became labor unions, the Graduate Student Employees' Union began organizing at UCLA and immediately began lobbying in favor of Bates' bill to amend HEERA.<sup>56</sup> GSEU, however, never developed beyond a nascent organizing campaign.

As early as October 1983, AGSE was in communication with GSEU and GSEA. In December 1983, AGSE leaders publicly admitted that the organization needed to combat its isolation by helping ASEs on the other U.C. campuses organize unions of their own.<sup>57</sup> That same month, AGSE began mailing letters to graduate students throughout the U.C. system, seeking to build support for the formation of a statewide ASE union.<sup>58</sup>

**UAW organizes throughout the system.** In February 1984, AGSE began to investigate the possibility of affiliating with an international union and initially considered either AFT, Service Employees International Union, or UAW.<sup>59</sup> When the AGSE membership directed its executive board to continue exploring this option, AGSE contacted AFT, SEIU, California State Employees Association, California School Employees Association, Communication Workers of America, ILWU, and District 65, which itself had affiliated with the UAW in February 1986.

By spring 1986, the choice was narrowed to either CWA or District 65/UAW. When AGSE insisted on a financial commitment sufficient to organize ASEs throughout the U.C. system, CWA balked. District 65/UAW, in contrast, promised its full support.<sup>60</sup>

In the fall, the AGSE executive board recommended an affiliation with District 65/UAW, a choice that AGSE membership ratified overwhelmingly in February 1987. Taking prompt advantage of District 65/UAW's financial backing and experience, AGSE/UAW mounted an organizing campaign during the 1987-88 academic year. That successful effort swelled its ranks to over 3,000 members, allowing the union to file a petition with PERB seeking recognition as the exclusive representative of ASEs at U.C. Berkeley.<sup>61</sup>

AGSE/UAW's organizing efforts inspired other drives throughout the U.C. system. In October 1988, with the help of AGSE/UAW representatives, 50 ASEs at U.C. Irvine formed the Association of Graduate Student Employees and adopted a union constitution modeled after the original AGSE constitution at Berkeley.<sup>62</sup> The next spring, AGSE Irvine signed up 160 members, approximately 10 percent of the total ASEs at that campus, and approached District 65/UAW regarding affiliation. In spring of 1990, UAW informed AGSE Irvine that if it collected 150 signatures within two months in support of affiliation, UAW would provide staff to help sign up a majority of ASEs on the Irvine campus.<sup>63</sup> AGSE Irvine failed to reach that goal, and the organization disappeared within a year.

Meanwhile, in November 1988, graduate student employees formed an unnamed union at U.C. Davis. From the beginning, this organization coordinated its efforts with AGSE at U.C. Berkeley and explored the possibility of affiliating with District 65/UAW.<sup>64</sup> Unfortunately, this effort also fizzled.

Undeterred by the initially unsuccessful organizing efforts at Irvine and Davis, UAW continued to build momentum for a statewide ASE organizing drive. It was not long before these efforts bore fruit. GSEA at U.C. Santa Cruz was revived in November 1988 and almost exactly a year later voted to affiliate with District 65/UAW. By May 1990, over 75 percent of the ASEs at Santa Cruz had joined the union, and GSEA/UAW filed a petition with PERB for recognition.<sup>65</sup> Two years later, District 65/UAW had organized the Association of Student Employees at U.C. San Diego, signed up a majority of ASEs, and petitioned PERB for recognition.<sup>66</sup>

In the fall of 1992, ASEs at U.C. Davis decided to try unionizing again and formed the Association of Graduate Student Employees. The next February, AGSE Davis voted to affiliate with UAW and launched a membership drive. By spring, AGSE/UAW Davis had signed up a majority of ASEs and petitioned PERB for recognition.<sup>67</sup>

Soon to follow, in 1994, the Student Association of Graduate Employees at UCLA and the Associated Student Employees at U.C. Santa Barbara signed up a majority of ASEs on their respective campuses and petitioned PERB for recognition.<sup>68</sup> By this point, there was no question that UAW unions for ASEs at U.C. were here to stay.

## DEFINING WHAT WORKS

Using the objective indicators described above, it is easy to see that four different ASE organizing campaigns (AFT Local 1570 at U.C. Berkeley, AFT Local 1781 at UCLA, GSU at U.C. San Diego, and AGSE at U.C. Berkeley) at one point or another established their viability in the U.C. system. These four campaigns shared some common perspectives: (1) they all identified with, and sought to affiliate with, the broader labor movement; (2) they all to one degree or another rejected campus parochialism and sought to organize ASEs statewide; and (3) they all focused first and foremost on workplace concerns affecting the majority of ASEs, instead of trying to build an organization by rallying as many ASEs as possible around a pre-set ideology.

Arguing over whether unionization should be driven by ideology or by the working conditions of employees may seem strange to some, but it is an old debate among ASEs at U.C. These competing organizational models were the major dispute during the formation of Local 1570 at Berkeley, when ASEs overwhelmingly chose to create a labor organization rooted in workplace concerns instead of simply being another political pressure group. Tellingly, a scant three years after its birth, Local 1570 was the only surviving organization to come out of the Free Speech Movement. All the explicitly political groups had withered away.<sup>69</sup>

It also bears noting that when ASEs at UCLA tried to form an ideologically driven union in 1967, that organization collapsed after barely three meetings.

This is not to say that the viable campaigns described above were ever apolitical. On the contrary, most had from the beginning spoken out on political issues both

within and beyond the campus borders. Local 1570 was extremely outspoken about its politics, having been forged in the heat of the FSM strike; it engaged in two more political strikes during its nine-year existence. Local 1781 similarly was political, particularly around issues of diversity. It fought alongside student organizations to overturn the *Bakke* decision and otherwise spoke out against the declining enrollment of minority students at UCLA.<sup>70</sup>

AGSE as well has taken a variety of political stances from the beginning, ranging from solidarity with Central American trade unionists to support for affirmative action and opposition to nuclear proliferation.<sup>71</sup> Being rooted in the workplace concerns of ASEs, however, allowed these campaigns to reach out to significant portions of the students on campus and convince them that their interests were best served by joining together, despite whatever ideological differences might exist. It was this focus on becoming majoritarian organizations, active both on a systemwide level and as part of the American labor movement, that allowed these four campaigns to garner broad support, mobilize their members, and create organizations that would not simply disappear after one academic term.

<sup>1</sup>"UAR to Investigate Charges of Violation of Wage Agreement," *Daily Californian*, October 19, 1938, at 1.

<sup>2</sup>"Another Budget Problem," editorial cartoon, *Daily Californian*, November 8, 1939.

<sup>3</sup>Sidney Ingerman, "Employed Graduate Students Organize at Berkeley," *Industrial Relations*, October 1965, at 142, note 6.

<sup>4</sup>Robert Hurwitt, "Present at the Birth: A Free Speech Movement Journal," *East Bay Express*, September 28, 1984.

<sup>5</sup>"Chronicle of the Free Speech Controversy," FSM leaflet distributed November 23, 1964.

<sup>6</sup>*Supra*, note 4.

<sup>7</sup>*Supra*, note 3 at 142-43.

<sup>8</sup>*Id.*, at 141.

<sup>9</sup>*Id.*, at 144.

<sup>10</sup>*Id.*

<sup>11</sup>*Id.*, at 141. By March 1969, Local 1570 also represented undergraduates employed as readers.

<sup>12</sup>"Local 1570: The Forceful Voice of Students and Employees," union brochure circa 1968.

<sup>13</sup>University of California (Berkeley), 11 PERC 18054 (Case No. SF-CE-179-H), 1987, at 293-94.

<sup>14</sup>Harvey Dong, "Third World Student Strikes at SFSU & UCB: A Chronology," June 29, 1998, <[www.ethnicstudies.com/history/chronology.html](http://www.ethnicstudies.com/history/chronology.html)>.

<sup>15</sup>*Id.*

<sup>16</sup>Teresa Ghilarducci, "HEERA: Representation of Student Employees," *CPER* No. 39, at 55.

<sup>17</sup>"RAs, TAs Unite to Clarify Status," *Daily Bruin*, January 31, 1967, at 1.  
<sup>18</sup>"Grad Employees Organize," *Daily Bruin*, February 8, 1967, at 1.  
<sup>19</sup>"GAE Votes to Affiliate With Teachers' Union," *Daily Bruin*, February 22, 1967, at 1.  
<sup>20</sup>"GAE Hit by Resignations," *Daily Bruin*, March 2, 1967, at 3.  
<sup>21</sup>"Grads Stage 'Work Action,'" *Triton Times*, March 10, 1975, at 1.  
<sup>22</sup>"Work Action Halted," *Triton Times*, April 4, 1975, at 1.  
<sup>23</sup>"Grads Organize Union in Face of Support Cutbacks," *Triton Times*, May 7, 1975, at 1.  
<sup>24</sup>"GSU Formed to Fight Worsening TA Situation," *Triton Times*, September 22, 1975, at 12.  
<sup>25</sup>"Substantial Support Expected for Work Stoppage; Action Opposed by Some TAs," *Triton Times*, June 3, 1975, at 1.  
<sup>26</sup>"GSU Continues 'Work Stoppage,'" *Triton Times*, June 4, 1975, at 1.  
<sup>27</sup>"GSU Strike Labeled Gratuitous," *Triton Times*, November 10, 1975, at 2.  
<sup>28</sup>"UCSD Graduates Hold Strike," *Daily Bruin*, November 26, 1975, at 5.  
<sup>29</sup>"GSU Votes to Postpone Indefinite Strike," *Triton Times*, January 9, 1976, at 1.  
<sup>30</sup>"GSU Calls for Strike Vote on November 3," *Triton Times*, October 24, 1975, at 1.  
<sup>31</sup>"GSU Votes on Union Affiliation," *Triton Times*, November 17, 1975, at 8.  
<sup>32</sup>"Union Tie-Up Vote Falls Short in GSU," *Triton Times*, January 5, 1976, at 1.  
<sup>33</sup>"GSU Not Dead' — Members Seek Organizing on State Level," *Triton Times*, February 13, 1976, at 1.  
<sup>34</sup>"The Political History of UCSD," *The Official 1994 UCSD Disorientation Manual*, at 55.  
<sup>35</sup>"Reduction of TA's Protested at Rally," *Daily Bruin*, April 6, 1977, at 4.  
<sup>36</sup>"Union TAs Vote for Walkout," *Daily Bruin*, April 28, 1977, at 1.  
<sup>37</sup>"TAs in Walkout Join Campus March Protesting Racism," *Daily Bruin*, May 2, 1977, at 1.  
<sup>38</sup>"TAs Protest Inaction: Plan Second Walkout," *Daily Bruin*, May 9, 1977, at 7.  
<sup>39</sup>"TAs Given Support," *Daily Bruin*, May 11, 1977, at 1.  
<sup>40</sup>*Id.*, at 7.  
<sup>41</sup>"TAs Vote 106-77 Against Strike Today," *Daily Bruin*, May 16, 1977, at 1.  
<sup>42</sup>"TA Protest Postponed Until Fall," *Daily Bruin*, May 20, 1977, at 1.  
<sup>43</sup>"Graduate Assistants and the Law," UGAB leaflet circa 1978.  
<sup>44</sup>*Supra*, note 16.  
<sup>45</sup>Lee Badgett, "Looking for the Union Label: Graduate Students At U.C.," *CPER* No. 85, at 7.  
<sup>46</sup>"Student Employees' Association," *AGSE Viewpoint*, September 9, 1985.

<sup>47</sup>"AGSE's Legal Challenge," *AGSE Viewpoint*, December 6, 1983, at 1.  
<sup>48</sup>Letter from Richard Boyden (AGSE) to Howard Kimeldorf, dated December 30, 1983.  
<sup>49</sup>"Cause for Celebration #1," *AGSE Viewpoint*, March 5, 1985, at 1.  
<sup>50</sup>"286 Berkeley Grads File Charges Against U.C.," *AGSE Viewpoint*, November 6, 1985, at 1.  
<sup>51</sup>"Settlement on Reclassification," *AGSE Viewpoint*, May 12, 1986, at 2.  
<sup>52</sup>Letter from Barry Broad (U.C. Davis) to Teresa Ghilarducci (UGAB), dated January 29, 1979.  
<sup>53</sup>GSEC Newsletter, December 11, 1981.  
<sup>54</sup>*Supra*, note 45, at 10-11.  
<sup>55</sup>"We Are Not Alone," *AGSE Viewpoint*, October 17, 1983, at 1.  
<sup>56</sup>Letter to legislative staff from Caroline Tesche, associate director of the University of California Student Lobby, dated January 4, 1984.  
<sup>57</sup>"Where Is Our Union Going?" *AGSE Viewpoint*, December 6, 1983, at 4.  
<sup>58</sup>*Supra*, note 48.  
<sup>59</sup>"AFL-CIO Advice," *AGSE Viewpoint*, February 21, 1984, at 2.  
<sup>60</sup>"History of Affiliation," *AGSE Viewpoint*, December 2, 1986, at 3.  
<sup>61</sup>"U.C. Just Says No," *AGSE Viewpoint*, November 28, 1988, at 1.  
<sup>62</sup>"Union Organizing Spreads to Other U.C. Campuses," *AGSE Viewpoint*, November 28, 1988, at 3.  
<sup>63</sup>"Teaching Assistants Looking to Unions," *New York Times*, April 22, 1990.  
<sup>64</sup>*Supra*, note 62.  
<sup>65</sup>"Santa Cruz Graduate Student Union on the Move," *AGSE Viewpoint*, November 12, 1990, at 1.  
<sup>66</sup>"News From San Diego's ASE," *State of the Unions*, March 1, 1993, at 2.  
<sup>67</sup>"Statewide Organizing Update," *AGSE/UAW Viewpoint*, August 1993, at 4.  
<sup>68</sup>See "State of the Unions," *AGSE/UAW Viewpoint*, January 1994.  
<sup>69</sup>*Supra*, note 12.  
<sup>70</sup>*Supra*, note 42.  
<sup>71</sup>See *AGSE Viewpoint* issues dated October 17, 1983, and December 6, 1983.

# Protecting the Rights of State Employees — Against Compulsory Unionism

By Milton Chappell and Randy Wanke

The election of Democrat Governor Gray Davis and a Democrat majority in the state legislature has marked a significant increase of compulsory unionism abuses in California.

The automatic deduction of agency fees from the paychecks of tens of thousands of California State University and University of California non-union employees began in January 2000, pursuant to S.B. 645.<sup>1</sup> The same automatic, non-negotiated deduction of fees from the paychecks of tens of thousands of non-union California K-12 and community college employees is proposed in S.B. 1960. That bill passed the Senate and, at the beginning of July, was awaiting almost certain Assembly approval and Davis' signature, which would make it effective with the new 2000-2001 school year.

At the urging of "Big Labor," Davis has opened the floodgates for legislation and collective bargaining agreements designed to increase union power over state employees who are now forced to pay union dues as a condition of employment.

What is even more troubling is the degree to which California's elected and government officials are complicit

in this assault on the constitutional rights of workers.

Whether it is due to ignorance of the law, fear of political retaliation, or strong ties to Big Labor, state officials are systematically carrying out the illegal demands of union officials and violating the rights of thousands of dedicated public servants.



Since 1976, Milton L. Chappell has been a staff attorney with the National Right to Work Legal Defense Foundation. Randy Wanke is the Foundation's director of legal information. Located in Springfield, Virginia, the Foundation is a non-profit organization that provides free legal aid to employees whose rights have been violated by compulsory unionism abuses.